

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **SPF SIG Advisory Council**

**September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

**3:00-4:15 PM**

The following Advisory Council Members were present: June Sobocinski, Shirley Gifford, Krysti Bland, Crystal Koeneman representing Anna Fairclough, Audie Holloway, Donn Bennice, Kate Burkhart, Jesse Metzger, Diane Casto, Kathy Graves, Melissa Stone, Barbara Henjum, Jodi Barnett, John Moller, Kathy Allely and Devon Urquhart.

#### **❖ Hybrid Stratified Planning Model**

During earlier meetings it was decided that the SPF SIG will focus on areas and populations within Alaska that demonstrate high numbers of consumption/consequences as well as high rates. Examples of areas with high numbers include the urban community of Anchorage with its high numbers of Minor Consuming charges; rural areas in the Gulf Coast, Southeast and Interior Alaska have high rates of adult binge and heavy drinking. By focusing on high numbers and high rates the Advisory Council is utilizing a hybrid stratified planning model to make funding allocation decisions.

With this decision, it is also acknowledged that due to DHSS grant regulations and the desire to receive proposals from communities 'ready' to undertake the SPF SIG process with rigor and success, we will be utilizing a competitive process to solicit grantees from across the state, both urban and rural, and from all six Alaska Department of Labor regions (Northern, Interior, Anchorage/Mat-Su, Southwest, Gulf Coast and Southeast). Data related to regions with high numbers/high rates will be used in the final decision-making process, along with readiness and capacity to complete the 5-step SPF process and changeability.

#### **❖ Review of documents**

Diane sent several documents to Advisory Council members prior to this meeting. These documents are available to provide additional information as we decide how the planning model will be utilized. The documents are listed below:

1. High Priority Trends in Youth and Adult Alcohol Consumption: this document reviews the regions with the areas of highest concern in regards to the data.
2. Communities With "Some" Level of Readiness for SPF SIG Grants: this document lists communities which have utilized the SPF process, have training on or are implementing the Mobilizing Action Through Partnerships and Planning (MAPP) process, or are federal Drug Free Community Grantees. These communities may have greater readiness and capacity than others.
3. Alaska Alternative High Schools and 4<sup>th</sup> R Curriculum: this document lists the Alternative High Schools in Alaska and what community they are located in. It also lists schools which are using

the 4<sup>th</sup> R Curriculum, with a key indicating which Alternative High Schools are using the 4<sup>th</sup> R Curriculum.

4. Potential SPF SIG Funding Options: this document briefly reviews funding parameters as well as four (4) options for funding allocations.
5. Department of Labor Borough and Census Map: this document is a map of Alaska and breaks down regions, which may be helpful if the Advisory Council chooses specific regions to be funded.

#### ❖ **Questions and Answers**

Several Advisory Council members had questions which are listed below.

Q: How many students attend alternative high schools?

A: About 1,400 students attend Alaska's Alternative High Schools. This amount is about 1 percent of high school students. However, there is a significantly higher rate of high risk behaviors, consumption and consequences for this population, as documented through the 2009 Alternative High Schools Youth Risk Behavior Survey.

Q: How are we reaching the highest numbers regarding alcohol induced deaths and is suicide included in this number?

A: Alcohol related mortality and fatality data is not inclusive of suicides. While both of these are tracked through the Bureau of Vital Statistics, suicide and mortality are tracked on separate registries. How we will reach the highest numbers regarding alcohol induced deaths will occur at the community level; once communities have concluded their data assessment and determined which of the priority consumption and consequences present the biggest problem in their communities/regions, community-level strategies will be utilized to address the identified consequence.

Q: Do communities know about and/or have expressed an interest in the SPF SIG?

A: Agencies, communities and individuals have expressed a great deal of interest in SPF SIG funds; presentations have been made to current DBH grantees; the Alaska Behavioral Health Director's Association; the Alaska Health Summit; and other local community coalition meetings and event. There appears to be much interest in the SPF SIG and the upcoming grant opportunities.

Q: Are interested communities able to collaborate amongst themselves in their region to apply as a group?

A: Not only is it possible, it will be the expectation of the SPF SIG grant process. While most current DBH prevention grantees apply as a single agency, some have begun developing community coalitions, collaborations and/or partnerships—this is our preferred model. For the SPF SIG, grants will only be awarded to coalition-type groups—no individual agency will be awarded a SPF SIG grant that is not working with a diverse and broad group of community

partners. Of course, one agency will need to be selected as the official “fiscal agent” for the purposes of giving a grant award to an individual agency, if the coalition is not a separate non-profit agency.

### **Considerations/Discussion**

It should be noted that our total grant monies will equal approximately \$ 1.3 million dollars each year of grantee funding. In order to promote changeability with a larger amount of money, the SPF SIG should fund a small number of grantees. Our goal is to make no more than six (6) total grant awards to communities.

While considering urban and rural grants it is important to evaluate what we consider urban and rural. Those who live in Southeast Alaska consider Juneau to be a “hub” as well as an urban community. In most state definitions Alaska’s urban communities include Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau and the Mat-Su Valley. The Kenai Peninsula, while quite rural is on the road system and has been determined to be both rural and urban, depending on the nature of the discussion. For the purposes of the SPF SIG process it is recommended the Kenai area be determined urban due to their road access to services and resources.

The four funding options presented by project staff, include the use of the Epi data, as well as other readiness data presented. Alternative high schools, due to the high rates of risk behaviors related to substance use, are a focus in all four funding options; many Advisory Council members liked funding option #4, because it acknowledges high priority trends and allows rural and urban areas to be funded. Smaller grant awards may be given to grantees to begin a planning process in the SPF. The four funding options presented are:

#### **Funding Options:**

- #1: One (1) grant available per region (using the DOL Regions: Northern, Interior, Southwest, Anchorage/Mat-Su, Gulf Coast and Southeast). Local data-driven decision regarding which consumption priority they select. If youth alcohol consumption selected, coalitions must agree to work with area Alternative High Schools, if available, as one focus. Six (6) total grant awards.
- #2: One (1) grant available per region, excluding areas being served by the two SPF Tribal Incentive Grants (TCC Interior Region and Anchorage). This option would allow Fairbanks North Star Borough, SE Fairbanks, Denali area and Mat-Su to still be eligible to apply. If youth alcohol consumption selected, coalitions must agree to work with area Alternative High Schools, if available, as one focus. Six (6) total grant awards.
- #3: Four (4) total grants available; priority given to rural Alaska (with highest rates of alcohol-related crashes, alcohol induced deaths, Minor Consuming Alcohol charges, alcohol-related suicide and interpersonal violence). Regional priority would include Northern, Southwest, Southeast and Gulf Coast. If youth alcohol consumption selected,

coalitions must agree to work with area Alternative High Schools, if available, as one focus.

#4: Four (4) or six (6) total grants: 2 or 3 urban and 2 or 3 rural. Urban numbers are highest for youth MCA charges (Anchorage, Fairbanks, Palmer) and DUI/Alcohol-related crashes for adult alcohol use (Anchorage, Fairbanks, Mat-Su, Kenai). Rural rates are highest for adult alcohol induced mortality/deaths and binge drinking (Northern, Southwest, Interior, Gulf Coast and Southeast). Alaska Native's have the highest rate of alcohol-induced deaths at 65.2 per 100,000 compared to Whites at 14.9 per 100,000. Suicide rates also are highest in Northern and Southwest regions of Alaska. If youth alcohol consumption selected, coalitions must agree to work with area Alternative High Schools, if available, as one focus.

In New Mexico, applicants wrote a "letter of interest" to the state before submitting an RFP. If Alaska modeled this method, the Advisory Council could assess community readiness and measure capacity. To implement this process, there would be a two step selection process; a letter of interest would be submitted to the state rather than submitting an RFP.

To assist selected communities in the implementation of SPF Step 1-3, the state is proposing to hire a contract worker through an outside agency to provide TA to grantees during all stages of the SPF; this would also include the 3-6 months planning phase mentioned above.

#### ❖ **Funding Decisions**

In order for Diane Casto, SPF SIG Project Manager, to write the SPF SIG Strategic Plan and Request for Proposals the Advisory Council needs to decide how SPF SIG Funds will be allocated to grantees. Today the Advisory Council stated that they will pursue funding option #4, which focuses on urban and rural communities; the Advisory Council would like to have at least 2 rural and 2 urban communities funded. By choosing option number four, communities will be able to address high numbers and high rates of consumption.

Advisory Council consensus is that a competitive Request for Proposals will be developed, initially soliciting planning grants for communities; the planning stage can last for approximately 3-6 months. A possible extension may be available, if necessary. Once the planning process is complete, local strategic implementation plans will be submitted to the state for review and consideration for full implementation funding. Through the strategic implementation plan, the grantees will need to demonstrate their capacity to promote changeability to continue being funded into the implementation phase. SPF SIG funding amounts will be determined based on local needs assessments and analysis, community capacity to carry out the proposed strategic implementation plan, and the quality of the selected strategies and community readiness to carry out the proposed strategies for change.